

THE PUBLIC RELATIONS JOURNAL



\$5 A YEAR

50c A COPY

WHAT INDUSTRY EXPECTS FROM PR

By JOHN L. McCAFFREY

A PLAIN LESSON WE SHOULD HEED

By REX F. HARLOW

VOLUME 5
MARCH

NUMBER 3
1949

TABLE OF CONTENTS

WHAT INDUSTRY EXPECTS FROM PUBLIC RELATIONS	1
<i>By John L. McCaffrey</i>	
A PLAIN LESSON WE SHOULD HEED	7
<i>By Rex F. Harlow</i>	
COOPERATION BETWEEN INDUSTRY AND SCHOOLS . .	11
<i>By Dr. Paul B. Gillen</i>	
PROFESSIONAL STATUS OR PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS	16
<i>By Harold F. Strong</i>	
YOU CAN WRITE IT — BUT CAN THEY READ IT? . . .	17
<i>By Stephen E. Fitzgerald</i>	
THE GREAT CASTLE BAI	22
<i>By A. A. Eastman, Jr.</i>	
TELLING THE PRESS	24
<i>By Dorcas Campbell</i>	
THE HOUSE ORGAN	26
<i>By L. W. Horning</i>	
LOOK FOR THE BURS UNDER THE PR SADDLE	31
<i>By Erle Phelps Hannum</i>	
BOOK REVIEW SECTION	33
SUPERVISION IN BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY, <i>Reviewed by Benn Hall</i>	
FILM AND EDUCATION, <i>Reviewed by George S. Gladden</i>	
HANDBOOK OF RADIO PRODUCTION, <i>Reviewed by Hendry Lars Bart</i>	
ACTIONS AND PASSIONS, <i>Reviewed by Philip Klarnet</i>	
THE WEATHERVANE	36
WELCOME TO NEW MEMBERS	39
POSTINGS	40

THE PUBLIC RELATIONS JOURNAL

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE PUBLIC RELATIONS SOCIETY OF AMERICA, Inc.

VIRGIL L. RANKIN, *Editor* AGNES V. MARR, *Ass't. Editor*
 CHACE CONLEY, "*Book Reviews*" GEORGE D. SKINNER, "*Weathervane*"

Publications Board

G. EDWARD PENDRAY,	GEORGE CROWSON	HENRY C. LINK
<i>Chairman</i>	MILTON FAIRMAN	HENRY W. VON MORPURGO
C. C. CARR	HESTER E. HENSELL	JOHN E. PICKETT
CHACE CONLEY	MERRICK JACKSON	KENNETH C. PRATT

Copyright 1948, and published monthly by, the Public Relations Society of America, Inc., at 525 Lexington Avenue, New York 17, N. Y. Of the amount paid as dues by members of the Society, \$5.00 is for a year's subscription for *The Public Relations Journal*. Entered as second-class matter September 27, 1948, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879. Subscription rates: \$5.00 a year. Single copy 50c.

PR JOURNAL

Volume 5
Number 3

MARCH, 1949

What Industry Expects from Public Relations

By JOHN L. McCAFFREY

President, International Harvester Company

LET ME BEGIN by saying that I can't speak for what is vaguely called "industry." I don't believe anyone can. Industry is thousands of different companies, each with its own problems, its own philosophy and its own methods.

Let me say also that I am not going to tell you that you have to defend the free enterprise system, or explain the functioning of profits. If you don't al-

ready know that you have those jobs, you haven't been looking or listening for several years.

I can speak for myself, as the operating head of a sizable manufacturing business. I can tell you what I think a company has a right to expect from its public relations people. That is what I propose to do. If anyone else in industry happens to agree with what I say, so much the better, but I can't guarantee it.

As I understand public relations, a public relations executive has two duties. First, he has the duty of interpreting public attitudes and behavior to the management of his company. Second, he has the duty of interpreting the actions and ideas of his company to the various publics that are interested in it or affected by it.

If the public relations man is to do both these jobs, there are certain things I think he must have. You may think my specifications are stiff. They are. I think they should be.

Stop for a minute and look in the mirror. Look at your own descriptions of yourselves, as you have stated them

JOHN L. McCAFFREY began his career with National Harvester Company as a warehouse clerk in 1909 at a wage of \$40 per month. Between that time and May 1946 when he was elected president of the company he served as a motor truck salesman, branch manager, assistant sales manager, district manager, domestic sales manager, second vice president, and director and first vice president.

During the war he served as chairman of the company's Postwar Planning Committee and participated actively in working out a program of postwar expansion involving development of new products and the acquisition of new manufacturing and distribution facilities.

"What Industry Expects From Public Relations" was presented by Mr. McCaffrey before the Sixth National Conference of Business Public Relations Executives in New York on February 4th.

in this meeting and other meetings, as you have set them down in textbooks and speeches about public relations.

You have taken all business and industry for your field of action. You say — and you have said it many times — that public relations affects every phase of business life, that it is a part of every business operation. I don't see how you can do what you say you do, unless you meet at least three specifications. So I am going to talk about three things which I think your management has a right to expect from you.

Knowledge

The first of them is knowledge. And when I say knowledge, I do not mean just technical skill in the writing of a press release, or the combination of art work and color in an annual report, or the preparation of layouts and copy for an institutional ad. All those are useful and essential skills. But they are not what I mean by knowledge.

Based on your own descriptions, you have really set out to cover the waterfront. Maybe you do. I hope you do. But if you do, there is no limit to what you ought to know, from history to semantics, from engineering to literature, and back through psychology, politics, accounting, economics and sociology.

That's a large order. Let's look at it practically for a moment. You are spokesmen for industry. You are also spokesmen for an economic system organized on the basis of individual initiative, a capitalistic economy. It seems reasonable to me to expect you to know quite a lot about the nature and formation of capital, its employment and its preservation. You should know about the history of industry and organized labor in this country, about corporate financial policy and several other subjects. I think you should know more about them than just what is gleaned

from an occasional visit with the staff economist or with the treasurer or controller of your company.

You ought to know more than just your own side of the argument. You ought to know more than just what has happened since the New Deal. For your job, as I understand it, is not merely to see what is happening under your nose at the present time but also to fit that knowledge into the framework of what went before and what may come after, so that a pattern may be visible.

Let's be more practical still. Each of you, I assume, works for a particular company. You have, I assume, the free run of the place. You can go anywhere in your company and talk to anyone about anything. If that's true, you ought to know a lot about your company. You ought to know more about it than anyone else in it except the president and a few senior officers.

A Big Order

You ought to know the problems, the operations, the past record, the products and the services of your company as a doctor knows human anatomy. If you work for a large company, that's a big order, for the facts keep changing every day. But I don't see any way out. If you're going to be competent to interpret your company to the outside world or understand the effects of outside forces upon your company, you have to know it. You have to know what your company is, what it does, how it does it and why it does it that way.

I'm not going to talk about your knowledge of public attitudes or employee attitudes or government attitudes toward business in general and your business in particular. Obviously, you have to have knowledge of that kind.

What I do want to emphasize is this. I think your management has a right to expect that public relations people will

be more than just specialists in expression who have been attached to the company but are not really a part of it. I think we have a right to expect you to become good businessmen. I think we are entitled to have you know more about the system in which you work and the company of which you are a part. We have a right to expect that your knowledge will grow all the time — not just by having a certain amount of information rub off on you in the course of your daily work but by your own constant efforts to learn more.

It may have been all right for Will Rogers to know only what he read in the papers but it isn't all right for you. Public relations is a relatively new function in business. It has always been present, of course, but it was not singled out, christened and put on an organized basis until recent times. Public relations problems are growing all the time. If you are to be successful, your knowledge will have to grow faster than your problems. I believe, as I am sure you believe, that it can.

Imagination and Initiative

The second specification that I would make is this: management expects public relations people to have imagination and initiative. I don't think I have to argue the matter of initiative. I am sure it is even plainer to you than it is to me that a public relations man who has to be wound up with a crank before he starts is no good to anybody. A public relations man who has to have a problem pointed out to him before he recognizes it is something less than 100% efficient.

But I'd like to stop a minute on this question of imagination, particularly the ability to invent and create. I know that in public relations work, as in other kinds of work, there are a large number of tested techniques which work quite

successfully. I do want to point out, however, that there seem to be a number of problems in public relations which have not been solved to the complete satisfaction of most people. It looks to me as if some of them will not be solved until some new ideas are generated.

A Few of the Problems

I will mention only a few. One is the problem of getting widely scattered stockholders to take a real interest in the operations of a company. I know you have been changing the looks and the content of annual reports. I know some of you have held stockholders meetings around the country. You have done other things. All of them, I feel, are of some help. Not all of them may be worth their cost. I'm for you in your attempts. But I don't think anybody has hit the best answer yet.

Another is the problem of establishing better communications with employees. My company has done a number of things in that field and we are trying new ones all the time. We expect to keep on trying and we do see some results. But we are a long way from feeling that we know all the answers or that we have hit the best answer or combination of answers.

There are many others, but those examples will show you what I mean.

Now I have noticed one thing about public relations work and that is that there seem to be fashions in it. If one company tackles a community relations problem by holding an open house, many other companies immediately rush to hold open houses. I am not against the open house. We have quite a few of them. But I can't help wondering whether in all those cases an open house was the best answer.

I said at the outset that I could not speak for all industry because the prob-

lems of every company are different. By the same token, I don't believe a public relations program can be designed which will really fit a large number of companies. I don't think your work can be done by formula.

Custom Tailoring

I think we have the right to expect that our public relations people will do a custom tailoring job for us — that you will give an individual answer to an individual problem. You must have the imagination to invent new devices and chart new paths of action as the occasion requires them.

Don't misunderstand me, please. I am not saying that you should avoid what anybody else has done, just because he did it. I am saying that you should look carefully at each problem and see what solution your own imagination suggests to you. Don't apply Method B just because another company had a roughly similar problem and they used Method B. Maybe you can invent a better one.

Your work is a new sort of work. I think one of its attractions ought to be that it is not rigid, that you do have room to develop your own answers, that you are not bound by tradition and precedent.

I think also that we have the right to expect you not to get so involved with techniques that you lose your sense of direction. A technique in public relations is only a vehicle for an idea. You men are essentially merchants of ideas. The best delivery fleet of techniques in the world is no use to you unless you have something to put in them.

I have said that you must have knowledge. Look at your business in the light of that knowledge. Look at its policies and its practices. Let your imaginations loose and see if you can't come up with better policies and better practices. Ask yourselves whether, from

a public relations standpoint, your company can't do things better than it is doing them.

That's your job, as I see it, to have knowledge, to have imagination, and to combine those two things into a better way of operating. I have always believed and I still believe that public relations basically is something we do and not something we say. There has to be action. Words are fine. Words are important. But they are no good until something has actually been done, either by the adoption of a policy or by the execution of a policy. Words cannot be a substitute for acts.

I think you should test yourselves not by asking, "Does my company talk differently about things since I have been here?" but rather by asking,

"Does my company do things differently since I have been here?"

That means, of course, that your imagination has to be used inside your business as well as outside. It means that you have to do a job of selling your management first. I think that is natural and right, for I don't see how you can expect to sell strangers if you can't sell the people with whom you are working every day.

For all those reasons, I think the second quality which a public relations man must have is a creative imagination and the initiative and drive to get results from his knowledge and his imagination.

Conviction and Courage

The third thing I believe we are entitled to expect from our public relations people is conviction and courage.

I don't believe any public relations program has a chance to succeed unless both its acts and its words are honest and candid. We must actually be doing what we say we are doing. We must actually be doing it for the reasons we give, and not for some other reasons.

To me, there just is no substitute for being on the level.

I think that is just as vital in your dealings with your management as it is in your dealings with employees or stockholders or customers or the general public.

Let's be realistic about this. I have worked all my life in a sizable corporation. I know that there is often pressure — just as there is in any other human organization — to go along with the majority or to vote with the boss. I know there are times when a public relations man, like any other responsible official, may find himself in a minority of one. You may be in the position of the devil's advocate. But I think your management is entitled to your actual opinion, whether or not it happens to be the general opinion. You won't always prevail but that shouldn't worry you. Nobody wins all the time.

While I'm on the subject of courage, let me say one more thing. I think the public relations of most of us in business suffers because of a very human weakness. We are afraid to confess that we ever make a mistake. We seem to be afraid to admit that something we tried was not a success. I think that is wrong.

Mistakes

I don't believe we can go to the public with a story of unbroken success. We can't do it because everyone in the world knows that it is not true. Government makes mistakes. Unions make mistakes. Even churches may make mistakes. And certainly it is no secret to us or to anybody else that business makes mistakes. We can't kid people about that and I don't think we ought to try.

We see that so plainly in our work in trying to establish better communications with employees. They know we're not perfect. We know we're not perfect. And we don't try to tell them that we

are. Sometimes our faces are red. But I believe, and I hope you believe, that it's better to have a red face once in a while and have people believe what we tell them, than to pretend we're perfect and have them discount everything we say.

Talk About It

I don't think industry ought to publicize only those things we believe will be popular. If we take an important step which we believe is right, we ought to talk about it, even if it is not going to get us any cheers just then.

To me, the last election has a big lesson for industry and especially for public relations people. All of us, I think, have leaned a good deal on polls and studies of public opinion, like the ones conducted by our friend here, Claude Robinson. Those studies have been very useful and valuable.

But what the election emphasized to me was this. The opinions reflected in a poll are not true forever. They are true only as of the time the poll was taken. They can be changed, in many instances, by courage, by candor, by willingness to stick out our necks.

Perhaps, in public relations work, there may have been some tendency to look at a poll any say,

"Well, here's what the people think. They're wrong about it but we just have to go along, even if we don't believe in it."

If there ever was such an attitude, I hope it is gone now. I think one of the things your management is entitled to expect from public relations people is the courage to say, when you feel you are right, "This is public opinion on this question. Let's change it," instead of, "This is public opinion, so we have to go along with it."

In other words, I think candor and honesty are "must" items in a public

relations man or a public relations program. You certainly should not go out looking for fights just for the sake of fighting. But you should never let either your management or your public get the idea that the public relations department is the department in charge of pussyfooting.

Those are the things I wanted to say to you public relations people. I doubt if there is anything new about them. You have thought of them all for yourselves. All I want to do is hit them again for emphasis.

As I have described what a public relations executive ought to be, I have described a kind of superman. I know that. There probably is no public relations man — for that matter, no human being — who meets all those qualifications all the time. Just the same, I think they describe the target all of us ought to shoot at.

Now I have talked to you for quite a while about the things I believe man-

agement has a right to expect from you. I think you are entitled to ask what you have a right to expect from management in return, as you go about trying to meet your responsibilities.

I said at the outset that I couldn't speak for all industry. I will now take that back, to a slight extent. I believe I can say a few things to you that would be true of all industrial managements with regard to our public relations people.

So I will say this:

We know you have new jobs with new and growing problems. We know that you haven't too many rules to go by. We know that there are no workable answers to some problems — yet. We owe you our support and encouragement as you tackle those problems. As reasonable people, we know that we can't expect you to win every time out. We do expect you to bear down as hard as you can on every pitch. And as long as you do that — we'll be for you, all the way.

MAKE YOUR PLANS NOW

Second Annual Conference

Public Relations Society of America, Inc.

Waldorf-Astoria Hotel — New York City — December 4, 5, 6, 1949

Now is the time — before your schedule becomes filled — to plan to attend the Second Annual Conference of the Public Relations Society of America, Inc. Those members who were in attendance at the First Annual Conference in Chicago last November are looking forward with enthusiasm to the Second Conference; planning to renew the many valuable friendships made in Chicago and to participate with other members in down-to-earth discussions of current problems of our field and Society.

Franklyn Waltman, Director of Public Relations, Sun Oil Company, Philadelphia, has accepted the chairmanship of our Second Annual Conference and seeks the helpful suggestions of all members to the end that this Conference may be a truly outstanding affair in public relations circles. Mr. Waltman's experience will be of great value. He was Chairman of the Sixth National Conference of Business Public Relations Executives and has served as a member of the sponsoring committee of this activity for some time.

The Second Annual Conference will immediately precede the 1949 NAM conference at the Waldorf and has been thus scheduled so that Society members from across the country may participate in both functions to their advantage.

Practical suggestions and ideas should be addressed to Mr. Waltman in care of the Society's headquarters office.

A PLAIN LESSON WE SHOULD HEED

By REX F. HARLOW

President, Public Relations Institute of the West, San Francisco

THE OTHER DAY I had a letter from a friend, a nationally known public relations counselor for whom I have great respect. Said he: "The situation in our profession is discouraging. The more I observe their operations the less respect I have for some men whose names are bywords in public relations. They are pretty frothy . . . and cold as a mackerel just out of the deep freeze."

The first of this year a man who has spent years in public relations left a good position as director of public relations of a large company to enter an entirely new line of business. The explanation given to the public was that he was seeking larger opportunities. But he started at the bottom to learn the new business, and the larger opportunities of which he speaks lie far ahead. What is the real reason for his abandonment of our field? Just this: lack of confidence in the future of public relations; dissatisfaction with the low place accorded it in public esteem; a feeling that the field is overrun with men of small caliber; a conviction that he had better get out while the getting was good.

Recently three practitioners familiar with the national public relations field were discussing certain prominent members of the profession. One of the three, speaking of a top producer who has a large practice and receives big fees, said: "He has only two measures for his work — how much it pays, and how much prestige it adds to him and his firm. He is nothing but a cold financial machine who loves to make a big show." Other leaders were also discussed, with first one and then another marked down for some reason derogatory to his character. Only one counselor — a man in

New York — won the unanimous approval of the group. He is successful financially but at the same time is public spirited and generous of his means and time in trying to elevate the morals and standing of public relations practitioners. He alone is a man whom the three would like to emulate.

Such illustrations could be multiplied indefinitely.

Why should this unlovely situation exist in public relations? Is it because the profession is so young? Because it is growing so rapidly? Because so many untrained, inexperienced men and women are flocking to it? Or is it that the very nature of the activity is such that we can never expect anything better than what we now are and do? Is public relations work fundamentally "slick," a cold money-making operation in which shrewd men and women can engage to their personal advantage? Will it ever attract large numbers of strong men of good purpose and stimulate in them a desire to build the profession so that it is universally respected by the public? Can public relations ever become an honored profession engaged in by distinguished practitioners, like law, medicine and other professions?

These are serious questions which could well be considered carefully by every thinking person in public relations. In fact, they are questions that have to be answered satisfactorily if we are to go ahead safely with our profession.

Some among us may say, "Let the theorists play with such ideas; as for us, we will devote our time to more productive pursuits. We have enough to do in taking care of our own business, with-

out borrowing trouble in the form of other people's business."

Others may say: "Why call on me as a single individual to help? If I do my own job as best I can, that's all anybody should expect of me. Besides, that's as much as I am able to do. This is a tough game which takes every ounce of my strength to make good in."

Still others may say, "To heck with such tripe! The best thing all of us can do for ourselves and public relations is to be first class practitioners. Let's take care of our clients. If we do that satisfactorily, we need have no fear for the future: it will take care of itself. Shoddy work is our worst enemy. If we eliminate that, we can lie down at night with a clear conscience and faith that the future will be bright. Our profession will rise or fall on the quality of work we do as individuals, and on nothing else."

These are understandable viewpoints, each of which is supported by an element of truth. But they are also short sighted, and to a degree selfish. They do not take into account the responsibility which each of us has to contribute something of value to the public relations profession. And this responsibility reaches even beyond that, involving us individually and collectively in the broad question of the public good. We must be citizens first and public relations men second. We cannot evade the responsibility of contributing to the public interest as well as to our private interest.

We're Not Alone

We know that our profession is not alone in receiving public censure. The current attack on the medical profession is a case in point. Both the individual doctor and his profession are under a cloud of heavy criticism. So strong and bitter are the things being said about doctors, and so aroused is the public,

that thoughtful members of the medical profession are concerned lest the professional structure that has been erected so laboriously through the centuries will be destroyed. And so the American Medical Association is asking for help — turning to us in public relations for aid in extricating doctors from their difficulties.

Too Late?

Standing on the sidelines, we can see where the doctors have made their mistake. They have been so absorbed in their individual and professional affairs that they have failed to pay heed to the unfavorable public reaction they were creating. They have been individual-minded instead of public-minded. They have failed to keep the public informed on their purposes, problems and achievements. Now they are surprised and hurt because their motives are questioned, their methods criticised, their whole manner of functioning censured. Forced to plead their case before the bar of an angry public opinion, the decision may go against them. They are trying desperately to save the day but their efforts may be too little and too late.

The profession of law has had its ups and downs through the years, too. The tide of adverse public opinion has rolled over the lawyer's head time and time again. The rapaciousness and slick tactics of attorneys have been the target of public attack on many occasions. Every charge which we in public relations are having hurled at us today has been multiplied many times over against the lawyer and his profession. Like the doctor, he is trying to do something about it. The American Bar Association, various state bars, and individual lawyers the nation over are trying to use public relations to win for themselves better acceptance, more approval and improved

professional opportunities. They are trying to make amends for their former indifference and lack of foresight. But the cost is great and the returns less than desired.

The lesson for us in public relations is plain. We are in the enviable position of having an abundance of laboratory cases about us to draw upon. If we are not alert and intelligent enough to use them as a valuable guide for our individual and collective efforts we hardly deserve to progress. Above all other professions ours should be the leader in building productive relations — among ourselves, with those we serve, and with the public at large. Building sound relations is our business. If we cannot do this job for ourselves we have little right to ask that we be hired to do it for others. How can we expect to build and hold the confidence of others if we do not demonstrate competence in the successful conduct of our own personal and professional relations?

Food For Thought

An English student of our field, a visitor to our shores for the purpose of studying public relations in the United States first-hand, gives us food for thought. After pointing out that we public relations practitioners should be wise and moderate in our pretensions and "be careful not to bring themselves into ridicule by opening their mouths too wide," he says that we should rely as much as we can upon solid achievements but will be foolish if we trust entirely to others for proper recognition of our merits and do not press our claims before the bar of public opinion. "There are three main reasons why public relations has a mixed reputation," he says, "They are: 1) Public relations practitioners are identified with unworthy causes; 2) they are thought to use dishonest and other undesirable methods;

3) some of their claims are believed to be 'eye wash'."

This points to the need in our profession of what someone has called "higher standards of accuracy, relevance and taste."

Common Sense Rules

And yet, there are public relations men who say that we do not need to develop a code of ethics or professional practices. This seems strange to me. Whether our profession, through its national body or otherwise, sets up an official code, it is incumbent upon each of us to observe a few common sense rules, among which I would list the following:

- 1) Be modest in bearing and statements but firm in support of ideals and ethics.
- 2) Cultivate a taste for the higher things of life, in order to increase our own stature and the dignity of the public relations profession.
- 3) Be open minded, seekers of the truth, and eager to learn our business thoroughly and use our knowledge and skill in ways productive to both those we serve and the public.
- 4) Be careful to represent ourselves to be only what we are, not pretend to be able to do more than our capacity, training and experience warrant.
- 5) Take an active part in constructive professional activities, as members of professional societies and associations and as participants in conferences, round tables and other professional meetings.
- 6) Keep abreast of the best developments in public relations, contribute freely of our knowledge and experience in improving the profession through writings, lectures, etc.
- 7) Uphold the good name of public

relations and those in it who are honorable and competent, but be frankly critical of unsound practices and incompetent and dishonest practitioners.

- 8) Give solid support to communication research, especially into the "dynamics of group behavior" and the working of mass media.
- 9) Make a systematic effort to improve public relations techniques and tools.
- 10) Work out a reasonably coherent and practical philosophy of public relations which deserves and therefore likely will receive acceptance.

These things we can and should do. If they are done consciously and intelligently they may help us avoid some of the sad experiences of older professions.

We have much to gain and little to lose by taking this positive, constructive step. It will be warmly welcomed by both our clients, and the public, and will pay us the handsome dividends which we desire and seek.

PUBLIC RELATIONS COURSES IMPORTANT

Newsweek recently reported that the Society for the Advancement of Management has polled 954 business executives and 200 economics and business professors in the last two years to determine what college courses best prepare young men for business.

In general, the executives attached greater importance to subjects like salesmanship, public relations, sales promotion, and budget control.

The professors, taking the academic approach, thought statistics and business law more valuable. Courses in salesmanship they figured were distinctly non-essential.

ANNOUNCING

... a new book that points
up the important functions
of public relations in sound
business management.

JUST OUT!

PUBLIC RELATIONS IN MANAGEMENT

By J. HANDLY WRIGHT

Director of Industrial and Public Relations,
Monsanto Chemical Company

and BYRON H. CHRISTIAN
Associate Professor of Journalism, University
of Washington 229 pages, \$3.25

"There is an unwarranted assumption among some executives today," state the authors of this new book, "that they can purchase good public relations over the counter like a bar of soap, that they can call

in a miracle man who will win public good without disturbing the policies and practices of the enterprise." **PUBLIC RELATIONS IN MANAGEMENT** corrects this belief by showing how essential a part public relations plays in the overall management function of any business or industrial organization. It defines, explains and evaluates good public relations, and analyzes the tools, techniques, and methods that business leaders can use today to ensure good relations with employees, customers and labor unions, with the community and general public.

Profuse with examples, **PUBLIC RELATIONS IN MANAGEMENT** illustrates how specific public relations policies must be planned and directed at the management level. It shows how to plan all kinds of public relations campaigns, put them into effect, maintain them at high gear, and obtain the desired result.

PARTIAL CONTENTS:

• Know Your Publics • The Public Interest • Who Does Public Relations • Public Relations in Action • Planning the Program • The Problems of Business • Business and the Community • Business and Supporting Publics • The Trade Associations • Government and Politics • Labor Enters the Field • Public Relations in the Social Field • Letting the Public Know • The Future in Public Relations.

10 DAYS' FREE EXAMINATION

MCGRAW-HILL BOOK CO., Inc.,
330 W. 42nd St., NYC 18

Send me Wright and Christian's **PUBLIC RELATIONS IN MANAGEMENT** for 10 days' examination on approval. In 10 days I will remit \$3.25, plus a few cents postage, or return the book postpaid. We pay mailing costs if you send cash with this coupon. Same return privilege.

Name
Address
City Zone State
Company
Position PRJ 3-49

Says THE PUBLIC RELATIONS JOURNAL:

"... The first volume written specifically for the executive and supervisor in the front office and plant... Of real significance and lasting value to American business and industry... Will unquestionably be read with interest by working public relations men and women."

COOPERATION BETWEEN INDUSTRY AND SCHOOLS

By PAUL B. GILLEN, Ph.D.

Director of Educational Research, Hill & Knowlton, Inc., New York

IT IS LIKELY that American industry and commerce spend something in the neighborhood of \$100,000,000 annually for cooperating with schools. While only estimates can be hazarded, it is highly probable that a significant amount of this money — a conservative estimate would be one-fourth to one-third, — is not spent very effectively. The chief difficulty is that many of the materials created by business and industry for use in schools are not sound educationally. Too many of those concerned with creating school materials, or perhaps those who make organization policy, do not understand schools and have a very limited knowledge of modern educational thinking, teaching practices, and school requirements.

A school program is very worthwhile, but it requires specialized talent and intelligent effort. If public relations men seek to work with schools, one of the foremost requirements for success is knowledge about education and its requirements. One need not necessarily be a professionally trained educator, but should have knowledge of educational philosophy and principles, and be willing to keep abreast of developments in educational methods. Cooperation with schools should not be taken lightly as its proper pursuance demands thought, planning, time and money — and even more importantly, it demands honesty, a large measure of altruism and hard work.

Schools are interested in American industry and business, but they do not solicit patronage from any particular group. They have many needs, especially in the field of good educational ma-

terials, but, unfortunately, they have not been very articulate in telling business and industry how cooperation could be arranged, except in the field of vocational education and to some degree in the area of business or commercial education.

The recent and current work of the Study on Consumer Education, sponsored by the Department of Secondary Principals of the National Education Association, has given us some of the criteria by which sponsored materials should be prepared. This study also makes some suggestions as to the needs of various subject matter areas. These suggestions are very helpful in a general way. However, it would be a sad mistake for an industry, without the benefit of substantial educational help and advice, to attempt to prepare materials for any given topic or problem.

Discovery and understanding of what constitutes the needs of schools is not easy. Even the casual advice of a few leaders in education may not be of much value to an industry seeking to cooperate with schools. One must come to have the feel and pulse of education as well as be able to erect dependable channels for discovering needs if he is to be successful in his school program. Important changes have been occurring in education; I cite some of these so that you may understand what is involved in trying to understand education.

Most of us think we understand present day education but actually our concept is heavily colored by our own school days. Education today is remarkably different from the days when you

and I went to school. Now it is really big business — big in many ways: finance, student and teacher personnel, plant investment, and the like. Many of us attended school at a time when education was weak and considerably less effective than it is today, in terms of the needs of our maturing American democracy.

Not the least of the forces which have precipitated many positive changes in education have been the rapid progress in the study of child development, educational psychology, educational and vocational guidance, education administration and, by no means least, a vast amount of educational research. Coupled with all these factors has been a comprehensive growth in curriculum and course of study building. I do not cite these, and other educational developments with the intent of overpowering anyone — I simply wish to point out that education has grown amazingly in many ways and has become much more highly professionalized than it was in our day.

Industry Grew Fast

These changes did not result from a surrounding vacuum. Industry and commerce were growing even faster. The advance of machine operations, coupled with the fruits of long years of research for industrial "know-how," resulted in a complex of forces demanding an enhanced literacy among our people. The newer mass media for communication also had their effect upon educational methods and procedures. Education is slow to change but its rate of change has remarkably accelerated in the last two decades. There are numerous signs that industry and education are moving towards each other more than ever before, especially since both are so vastly important for keeping a democracy on an even keel.

One outcome of these developments has been the emergence of some pride in accomplishment. The long, grinding, uphill road leading to better schools and a more professionalized staff has resulted in systems of education that are largely independent of political pressures and the inroads of vested groups. Boards of education, whether appointed or elected, set the rules and policies, leaving the operation of the schools and classroom teaching to the superintendent and his staff.

Great Responsibility

The great responsibility of these public servants is to see that our children obtain the best education possible. They should be required to make certain that developing minds are not fed biases, half-truths, prejudice, propaganda, and the like. Schools should be free to educate, consistent with the best interests of the nation.

Schoolmen have come to have some suspicions concerning the intentions of industry and business respecting prof- fers of cooperation. Because of the degree of educational independence already mentioned and also because of the fundamental and inexcusable violations of educational principles by many who have sought to cooperate with schools, a barrier exists concerning nearly all "outside" efforts. A few business organizations, through intelligent negotiations coupled with worthwhile educational materials, have been able to build a good degree of rapport with schools. One example is that of General Mills which adopted a good psychological lever — improvement of nutrition education — as its chief motivating force.

If we seek to work with schools, then all the cards must be face-up on the table, in plain view of any who care to look at them. Educators believe in and have faith in the American economic

system; they will work to defend and maintain it, but they reserve the right to accept or reject any materials, including books, that trespass upon well recognized educational principles. It is utterly useless and futile to attempt to "put something over" through trick use of words, graphics, or other means, however well the cliches may be disguised. This applies to any organization, whether industrial, commercial, labor or others.

Teaching Methods Changing

Teaching methods are changing almost continually in the search for optimum learning in the classroom. Despite this flux, which is a boon to educational progress, one thing is becoming increasingly clear, i.e., good teaching can no longer be predicated completely upon the time honored textbook method. Regardless of the methodology adopted, it is quite clear that education today needs a vast amount of good, solid, educational materials of all kinds. Interestingly enough, some leading educators are advocating teaching by way of all kinds of materials rather than depending entirely upon textbooks — some leaders even affirm that textbooks should be used in the supplementary sense. This should not be construed as a wholesale condemnation of good textbooks — they have their advantages and shortcomings.

One of the chief responsibilities of schoolmen is to see to it that boys and girls are given the kind of education that best prepares them to meet the challenges of life. For a significant percentage, but by no means the majority of our high school students, preparation for college is the main goal. Of the remaining number, a large fraction of the student body terminate their formal schooling upon high school graduation, but there are still a goodly number who do not survive the high school term. All

of these students need to learn, sometime during their early and later teens, much concerning the world about them. This does not necessarily imply that public and other schools should give on-the-job training, or even attempt to do so, but it does directly infer that students need to be taught and taught well the basic facts of life, industrially and economically speaking.

Somehow or other, too many students come to have a vague, hazy and far away concept or set of beliefs about industry, even those that are in the literal backyards of boys and girls. Without proper materials and good teaching skills, it is very difficult to prepare boys and girls to recognize and meet the problems of their communities or to know anything about the forces that shape community destiny.

Assuming that there is a big reservoir of teaching skills available, the most pressing problem is the supply of suitable materials. The furnishing of these by and from dependable sources necessitates the building of efficient channels of communication between consumers and users. Industry can make a very worthwhile contribution to schools, provided certain educational principles are observed.

Cooperation

Cooperation between industry and schools has a number of facets. Among these are good materials, furnishing of speakers, collaboration with community projects of interest to the schools, furnishing of scholarships, helping schoolmen with their budget battles, making company public relations talent available for consultation and advice, helping put over annual school affairs, supporting schools and interpreting their efforts, building a friendly line of communication between the school and the plant which involves having teachers

and students visit at convenient times, and in other ways. Industry has to demonstrate to schoolmen that it is not seeking to use schools as a sales channel, nor to glorify a given achievement or contribution.

Important Stake

Industry has a most important stake in American education and should by no means make the assumption that materials are the only service that it can render. If schoolmen are to be persuaded about the genuineness of industrial and commercial interest in education, then such organizations must show more concern, more initiative, and give more support to school interests.

Very few community industrial leaders (or their representatives) ever visit schools on a purely friendly basis, or invite the superintendent to lunch, or ask him what his concerns are. Only a handful of executives ever ask the superintendent how they could help with school problems. It is truism in good human relationships that more than passing interest in helping the other fellow must be shown if one would have understanding, support, and cooperation. So long as a personal and social gap exists between industry and schools, all efforts aimed at cooperating with schools on the part of industry must fall far short of the anticipated fruits of collaboration.

Another consideration in this whole matter calls for our attention. Most of those who have sought to cooperate with schools have assumed that the chief mechanism is the prose and graphic description of operations, processes or products of industry or business. There is a very important place for such materials, but there are other considerations of almost equal merit both for schoolmen and for industry. Thought should be given to the creation of ma-

terials needed by schools which may have little to do with our business or industry — this, for convenience, might be termed “indirect” materials.

Another service is the collaboration with worthwhile educational projects — research, demonstrations, and the like, sponsored by national, state or local groups. Industry has the responsibility of telling its direct story but perhaps has an even larger responsibility for supporting efforts of deep professional concern to educators. These efforts sooner or later have their impact upon the teaching that occurs in American classrooms. Helping educators regear and retool for new directions can be a very important service. Note that nothing thus far said has suggested or implied that sums of money *per se* be given to schools, for such could well be obnoxious to both industry and schools.

Check List

We turn our attention now to some principles underlying cooperation with schools, assuming here that we are interested solely, for the purposes of discussion, in telling our direct story. We will also assume that our interest lies in written materials, or possibly films or film slides, and that these are free of bias, propaganda, half-truths, and prejudice. What other criteria should we have observed in preparing the materials? I shall not spell them out but merely list them in question form.

- 1) How do you establish educational need for what you prepare?
- 2) Do you use the shotgun vocabulary approach or do you create the materials so as to have three distinct versions of the same materials? That is, do you write in terms of three reading levels: grades 4, 5, and 6, middle high school, and adult reading levels?
- 3) Is this particular item an isolated

piece or is it part of an educational program?

- 4) How do you establish a tie-up with topics immediately surrounding your material?
- 5) What do you do to offer a range of challenge within your materials — that is, allow for individual differences?
- 6) What helps do you prepare for the teacher herself?
- 7) Do you give some consideration to the fact that half of the students are girls who, more often than not, shun technical words whenever possible?
- 8) What consideration do you give to curriculum patterns?
- 9) Do you write to interest children, or do you write to please the firm or yourself?
- 10) If you use illustrations, what is their degree of pertinence, ease of understanding, timeliness, and so on?
- 11) What consideration do you give to the convenience of the teacher and the pupil regarding size and ease of handling?
- 12) What is the psychology used in the materials? Do you assume that your young reader has some degree of intelligence and likes some op-

portunity to draw his own conclusions, apply his own criteria, or to have an opportunity to solve any problems you propose?

- 13) If your story is a fairly long one, do you give attention to presenting it in sequential units rather than in one treatment?
- 14) What do you offer in the way of possible applications of what the child reads to his range of knowledge of the outside world?

There are still other considerations, but I think I have said enough here to give you some notion of the complexities of preparing materials as a part of your program of cooperation with schools.

I should like to close with just a few thoughts. At the present moment, we know practically nothing about educational consumption practices, nor do we have enough knowledge on actual worth. Many persons glibly report a distribution of high numbers of this or that item and thus point with pride to the success of their educational efforts. It is even conceivable that a batch of commendatory letters from teachers only partly tell the story of potential worth. The whole field needs some good, basic research but the goals and outcomes are worth the effort.

PAUL B. GILLEN, *Director of Educational Research, Hill and Knowlton, Inc.*, has been engaged in various fields of education since 1923 and is the author of several publications covering significant aspects of present day education. He has served as sociologist at Cornell Medical College, has conducted considerable research into community health problems, and directed specialized activities for Columbia University in the relationship of school to community.

Prior to joining Hill and Knowlton, Inc., Dr. Gillen was assistant director of the Joint Commission on Education.

The foregoing article was presented at the Sixth National Conference of Business Public Relations Executives in New York City on February 4th.

Professional Status or Professional Standards

By HAROLD F. STRONG

Public Relations Consultant, New York City

MR. LAWRENCE APPLEY'S TALK at our Public Relations Society meeting in Chicago touched off a good deal of argument as to how far we public relations practitioners have to go before our work is recognized as a profession. A plausible case can be made for according it professional status, but the fact remains that there are no barriers to keep out the incompetent or the unscrupulous and no means of enforcing a code.

There are, however, two sorts of professions. We speak of "professional musicians" and, as I see it, public relations work has factors in common with music and the other arts. There are schools and colleges of music, and there are degrees of Bachelor and Doctor of Music. But achievement in this field is not often measured or rewarded by the amount or source of instruction or by the possession of a degree. Has Fritz Kreisler a degree? Or Toscanini? Who knows or who cares? No one would think of applying such a test or of denying that they are professional musicians of a high order. Public acceptance and general recognition of their attainments are the criteria.

So it is for the present in public relations. More power to the new schools of public relations and the increasing number of such courses in reputable institutions. Taking formal training ought to help a well-adapted man or woman to succeed. But, unlike law, medicine, engineering, or accounting, there are no definite imperatives in the body of knowledge and experience which a sound public relations practitioner must have. If he wins and holds the confi-

dence of good clients or that of a full-time employer, he develops standing. Probably each of us would make a different appraisal of a colleague's record and reputation. The usual test is: do those whom a public relations man or woman has served recommend him to others? This isn't infallible, for it sometimes happens that a public relations director or consultant is dropped or his work disparaged because he told the truth instead of being a "yes" man. But, by and large, reputation in public relations is something that is earned over the years by a record of honest and capable service and sound judgment, or of brilliant inventiveness and resourcefulness.

As knowledge and understanding of what is involved in public relations develops among the leaders of American institutions, it will become harder for public relations "quacks" to stay in business. Gradually it will become recognized that our work, when rightly performed, is of professional character. It is our responsibility to maintain professional standards, to evolve and follow a code of ethical practice and to put the weight of organized group opinion behind it. But probably for years to come, each man and each firm is likely to be judged on the basis of achieved standing and will have to meet the competition as it comes, with no club to swing over the heads of untrained or unworthy pretenders. Booker Washington once said: "The Negro thinks too much about getting recognition and not enough about getting something to recognize." We might take the hint.

You Can Write It — But Can They Read It?

By STEPHEN E. FITZGERALD

Public Relations Consultant, New York City

THE PRESS RELEASE is a form of literature I despise. It is cramped and artificial — a convention. Besides, I have developed a special form of allergy, and whenever a press release is in the offing there arises a specter — a memory from Government service, of reporters rushing to my office, mimeographed sheets in hand, to demand: "Say — what does this really mean?"

My counter was standard. "What do you mean, what does it mean? It just means what it says." But the reporters usually had the top word. "All right, what *does* it say?"

The main trouble was that Government announcements are produced by a method which has been called "cooperative prose" — a creative form full of

difficulty. I recall one case in which a release became so involved that it had to be followed by another press release to explain the first; the second was almost as bad, so a third was issued, in order — as we of the WPB Information Division archly said — "to clarify the situation."

It all has a faintly comic ring, but there is precious little humor in the conversion of a form of mass-communication into a form of mass-confusion. And the problem is by no means confined to Government.

The scientists, especially the social scientists, are among the worst offenders, with a jargon all their own. Try this one from an article in the magazine *Science*:

"When this purpose can be determined by information, such robots are called servo-mechanisms. In other words, the basic premise of both the traditional philosophical dualists and idealists and the traditional, supposedly scientific naturalists and mechanists, to the effect that natural and biological systems can have neither knowledge of universals nor normatively defined and behavior-controlled purposes, must be rejected."

Expository writing doesn't have to be quite so disconcerting. Selig Hecht's excellent "Explaining the Atom," for instance, is a brilliant example of exposition which can be understood by almost anyone; and the work of such men as Stuart Chase, in the social sciences, and Paul de Kruif, in the medical sciences, shows that clarity is not wholly elusive.

The following comes from a recent advertisement in *Life*, published by an

STEPHEN E. FITZGERALD served on the editorial staff of the Baltimore Sunpapers for 12 years before entering Government service in 1941. He was on leave from the Sunpapers in 1939 and '40 to study at Harvard University under a Nieman Fellowship. In Washington he served successively as Director of Information for the War Production Board and as Assistant Director of the Domestic Branch of the Office of War Information in Charge of Operations. After two years in Buffalo as Director of Advertising and Public Relations for the Bell Aircraft Corporation, Fitzgerald came to New York as an associate of Earl Newsum & Co. He left there to become head of a Special Unit at N. W. Ayer & Son Inc. in charge of public relations for the Army-Air Force Recruiting Campaign.

He opened his own public relations office in 1947.

Mr. Fitzgerald's article is an excerpt from his book "How To Get Ideas Across To People," to be published late in 1949 by Funk & Wagnalls.

oil company in the interest of greater public understanding of business problems:

"If your 12-year-old son was three feet tall in 1941 when he was 4, and five feet tall today, you can say with complete accuracy that his height has increased 66.6% in eight years. But if it cost you 60c to get his hair cut in 1941, and \$1.00 today, you can't say with complete accuracy that the price of hair cuts has increased 66.6% in that same time.

"For at today's hourly wage rates, the average American gets \$1.00 for the same amount of work that he was paid 60c for in 1941. Consequently, this particular haircut would cost most people the same number of minutes' work that it did eight years ago. The price hasn't changed. Furthermore, the barber's take hasn't changed. For the dollar he gets today — compared with what a dollar would buy him in 1941 — is worth only 60c."

This is supposed to be popular prose. Aside from being misleading (since prices, profits and incomes have *not* risen equally), it is a real intellectual problem to most magazine readers. And the difficulties are only multiplied when the same techniques are applied to annual reports, handbooks for employees and similar projects where complete lucidity is essential.

It is not necessary to labor the point that we face a curious paradox: our language has a tendency to become more specialized at the same time that the things we need to explain grow more complex. This would be bad enough if the communication problem were one of only technical interest. But it is one that intimately affects all of us. Everybody who has to get ideas across to others has a stake in trying to do the job with more precision. For the one real purpose of writing — absolutely the only possible purpose — is to communicate.

A BRIEF ACCOUNT of some of the recent efforts toward increasing our skills

in written communications may throw some light on the dilemma.

The Semanticists

The Greeks had a word for it — *semaneien*, meaning "to signify." And our modern word *semantics* was coined in 1897 by a Frenchman, Michel Jules Alfred Breal. Soon we began talking glibly about semantics as a possible solution to some of our problems of communication, though often without much understanding of what this pseudo-science really is. Contrary to some opinion, semantics is not primarily concerned with simplicity in writing, and some of the literature on semantics is close to the most difficult prose in the world.

Broadly speaking, semantics is concerned with the meanings of words and signs and symbols as we use them in our daily lives; with the connections and differences between these words and the things they stand for; and with the way in which these relationships between words and things affect our behavior. The aim of semantics is a social aim; it is focused on the problems of people. It has something to do with the way people use language, especially as a tool for thinking, and the way people understand or do not understand one another. The approach is a scientific approach, and on its fringes the subject matter stretches into physics and mathematics.

One of the points of emphasis which has daily importance — every time we hear a political speaker, or every time we read a newspaper editorial — is the fact that "words are not the things they represent."

Does this sound academic? It isn't. Consider, for example, the story about one of the opinion polling organizations, which, for a test, invented two companies and asked their respondents what

they thought of these corporations. One turned out to be easily the most popular company in the country; the other was easily the least popular. The name of the most popular was "The American Improvement Company." The name of the least popular was "The International Molybdenum Cartel." So does the ring of words produce intellectual Pavlov reactions.

A great many of the important business problems of the day are in part problems in semantics. Take the case of the company which is said to have a "bad labor policy." This trigger phrase sets off a kind of emotional chain reaction, even when there are no facts on which to base a judgment. Or take the case of the company president who is described by a union paper as a "dangerous reactionary." Is there any one specific thing, or set of things, which answers to the description "dangerous reactionary?" The phrase means only whatever the speaker and the hearer wish it to mean.

Because the problems of semantics are essentially complex, the prose of the semanticists is sometimes tough going. Consider a passage from Ogden and Richards:¹

"The distinction between the two aspects of mental process from the standpoint of the context theory may be briefly and therefore vaguely indicated as follows: Given the psychological context to which a sign belongs, then the reference made by the interpretation of the sign is fixed also. But it is possible for the same sign (or for signs with very similar characters) to belong to different psychological contexts. Certain geometric figures, that may be seen, more or less 'at will' either as receding or extruding from the plane upon which they are drawn offer well-known and convenient examples. If now we raise the question, How does the sign come to belong to the context to which

it does belong, or how does it pass from one context to another? we are raising questions as to the effective-volitional aspect."

But it is quite clear that the semanticists have made a major contribution to human communications, and Ogden and Richards have been among the leaders. We owe to them a substantial debt for helping us understand that public relations people, and many of their employers, use semantics in one way or another every day. When we decide whether the refusal of men to work should be called a "strike," a "work stoppage" or a "damnable crime against the people," we are making a decision in semantics. And when an executive asks a foreman who wants to discharge a worker for being a "trouble maker" just what he actually means, he is also using a tool of semantics. These tools become even more important when questions of "net earnings," "profits," "reserves," "depreciations" are involved.

Even those who have only the smallest understanding of what semantics is about are beginning to guide themselves by the theory that there is a difference between the symbol and the thing symbolized; between the reference and the referent; and between the empty word which is supposed to signify something and the vacuum which often exists when the referent is sought out.

Basic English

When Basic English was announced some twenty years or so ago, it was promptly pounced on. What these Basic people want to do, the critics wailed, is to make us talk in pidgin English, like a lot of laundrymen. Besides, what good are those experimental languages?

These complaints were absurd. Basic English is intended to do almost none of the things its critics alleged. More, it is not experimental and has already

¹ "The Meaning of Meaning," by C. K. Ogden and I. A. Richards; Harcourt, Brace and Company.

had an enormous influence on writing and education in a great many parts of the world. The concepts which went into the construction of Basic are at work today in every kind of written material. It has helped, and will undoubtedly continue to help, in our efforts to improve the tools of human communication.

The idea of Ogden and Richards, who invented Basic, was simplification and clarity. Basic uses a list of 850 words, and it has only 16 verbs. These are largely action verbs, like *give, get, take, put, come, go, keep, let*. Since verbs constitute the toughest part of any language to the learner, the restriction of verbs to 16 obviously could have enormous advantages in speeding up learning.

Another advantage: since the word list is 850 words, it is obviously necessary to keep away from the cloudy word, which has more glitter than meaning, and to use words to define more exactly just what the writer means.

Richard tells the story of the origin of Basic this way:

"We (Ogden and Richards) were comparing definitions — definitions of anything from a table to a force and from a rabbit to a concept — and we were struck by the fact that, whatever you are defining, certain words keep coming into your definitions no matter how diverse the things you are defining. This suggests that there might be a limited set of words in terms of which the meanings of all other words might be stated. If so, then a very limited language is possible, a language which would put a description (using only this limited set of words) in the place of any word outside this limited set."¹

This emphasis on definition was one of the great contributions of Basic.

Basic English was always conceived as an auxiliary tool, never as a substitute for ordinary English. And as for its

being awkward, read the following from Mr. Richards:

"Now let me say in more detail what Basic English is, what it is able to do, and how it does it. It is the most necessary part of the English language, a part complete in itself so far as it goes, but without any wall or division between it and the rest of English. The line round Basic is a teaching line — fixed by the question 'What is to come before What?' Basic is a system of English words, and of the way they are used together. It has been made as simple and regular and clear as possible; and given the widest general covering power without changing any English forms or ways of writing or talking. I am talking in Basic now . . .!"

Flesch and the Devil — of Ambiguity

A couple of years ago, the public relations, advertising and journalistic worlds were excited when Rudolf Flesch published "The Art of Plain Talk." It was the author's purpose to show how words could be used more effectively to communicate, to make written material more "readable." One of the "gimmicks" was a formula, by the use of which we could test our prose to see whether it rated "easy," "difficult" or in between.

The sudden popularity of Flesch's book itself showed that simple, readable language has an enormously more powerful appeal than dry, theoretical language. For his book was mostly a rewrite of his university thesis, which attracted no general attention; the published book did. Soon Flesch was a popular luncheon speaker and was being called on by newspapers and others for advice.

One would have thought that Flesch had invented "readability." This was far from the case. Flesch's most significant contribution was making the study of readability more popular.

The semanticists, of course, had been interested in readability — as *one* approach to their studies — for many years, and the question of clarity in

1. "Basic English and Its Applications," an address by I. A. Richards; *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts*; June 2, 1939.

style, and precision in writing, had been almost a commonplace preoccupation of writers for centuries. One of the reasons for this interest in recent years was the growing dichotomy between the physical and the social sciences, and the realization that part of the reason for the great strides being made in the physical sciences was their use of precise and definable terms, while the social sciences were still using the haziest kind of logic. The word *atom* is precise and exact; it is understood wherever science is understood. But what can we say of a phrase like *social context*?

The physicists, too, and the mathematicians had been tackling the same set of problems, and the "operational definition" of Percy Bridgman has had the widest influence. In education, such men as Edward Thorndike had long been active with word counts, frequency lists and basic vocabularies, all of which were well known not only to teachers but to advertising writers and a good many others in related fields. There have been, and are, dozens of others.

But Flesch, in his effort to drive out the devil of ambiguity, seemed to make more sense than most of his predecessors. He pointed out that the usual plea to keep sentences short and simple was only part of the job, and that sometimes efforts to simplify by using short sentences alone caused more ambiguity, not less. He also emphasized the importance of using personal references, and exposed the importance of affixes in making language more complex. Best of all, his formula provided or seemed to provide a handy yardstick that works.

THE QUESTION of readability is not a frill in the public relations or com-

munications field. And the reasons why it calls for attention can be illustrated by the difficulties of almost any ordinary complex word.

Take the word *imperceptibly*. First the reader has to grasp the concept of perception. Then he has to translate this into a variant, *perceptible*. Then the added step of the form *perceptibly*. And, finally, he has to go back to the beginning and add in the idea of the prefix, *im*, which negates the whole process he has been going through. Small wonder that words sometimes serve to confuse rather than to clarify.

It would be absurd to suppose that "readability" — by whatever name we call it — is likely to solve our communications problems. The task of "moving information" along a transmission belt into human heads is far too difficult. If the psychologists have proved nothing else, they have at least demonstrated, by experiment, how essentially complex the task is.

But one thing is clear. Words do *part* of the communications job. Words are building blocks, and we can build with them well or poorly. Only by using them well can we hope to communicate.

And the importance of that job is indicated by a statement by Elton Mayo, who said not long ago:

"I believe that social study should begin with careful observation of what may be described as communication: that is, the capacity of an individual to communicate his feelings and ideas to another, the capacity of groups to communicate effectively and intimately with each other. This problem is, beyond all reasonable doubt, the outstanding defect that civilization is facing today."

The Great Castle BAI

By A. A. EASTMAN, JR.

Copy Staff, Caldwell, Larkin & Company, Inc., Indianapolis

THE CAPTAIN OF INDUSTRY came home one evening, tired from the day's maneuvers in the War Against The Consumers.

As luck would have it, this was the cook's night out and he sat down to a skimpy meal of left-overs, after the slightly too-stiff cocktail. Perhaps it was just as well, however, for his resultant mistiness of mind led him to a somewhat hazy but new insight into an approach to his family. Maybe he would not have defined it just that way, but this evening he gave his young son something of far greater value than any of the usual expensive toys — he gave something of himself.

Thus it came about at Junior's bedtime, the Captain found himself sitting at the youngster's pillow, reading from a handsome book of adventure tales, set in the age of moats and knights and maidens fair. It would be hard to say which one of them nodded most, or succumbed first to the persuasive caress of late evening . . .

"The Great Castle BAI, representing Business And Industry, had stood for many years on Mt. Success. Presumably it was of unquestioned construction (being pre-war) and it was generally conceded by all members of the court that it would remain eternal.

Recently, however, Prince Profit, ruler of the Great Castle BAI, had noticed that the Sales Tower seemed to be leaning somewhat. As a matter of fact, when one viewed the structure from a little distance, rather than from one's own front yard, it gave the appearance of being a very uncertain structure, indeed.

Now, Prince Profit, ruler of the do-

main, gradually became a bit concerned. Could his property be decreasing in value? Strongly he suspected subversive plots on the part of his subjects in the low-land city of Consumerville. And immediately he set about to prevent any further anti-Management underhandedness.

The first directive decree issued provided for a constant spotlight to be played alternately on the Sales Tower, on the Production Balcony, and on the Ground Floor of Research. Night and day the spotlight was focused on these three sectors, thus covering and protecting the Great Castle BAI from top to bottom and up again.

But still the Tower continued to lean. It seemed very unsteady now, and poor Prince Profit, completely unnerved, was more than unsteady himself. As a matter of record, he took to drinking double martinis, without the olives, and missed seeing Lady Humor.

Now it happened that there was a certain refreshing Jester in the courts at that time known as Sprig-o-lettuce. This Jester, though he gave every appearance of being a green fool, was in reality far from it. He had a crisp wit and a deep, beneath-the-surface wisdom. And one day, after many successive unsuccessful days of failing to make the Prince Profit smile, such was that one's ill mood, he decided to be iconoclastic as the very devil and approach the Prince in a serious vein, with a true solution to his troublesome problem.

"Worthy master," said he, magnanimously without grimace, "it troubles me to see you bothered about the leaning Sales Tower."

The Prince churned in his ulcers but said nothing.

"Might I suggest, sir, a change in the lighting arrangements?" pursued the wise young Jester, Sprig-o-lettuce.

"We're covering the Tower, the Balcony and the Ground Floor!" roared the disgruntled Prince Profit. "What more would your infantile mind suggest?"

"Begging your humble pardon, sir," said the Jester, eagerly seizing the advantage, "but had you thought to cover the Foundation?"

"Well, and what about the Foundation?" queried the Prince, though somewhat resigned in tone and willing to listen to any suggestion. "Isn't it mostly buried?"

"Exactly, sire," replied Sprig-o-lettuce. "And shouldn't it perhaps be brought to light? The Great Castle BAI rests on the backs of nearly forgotten castle Employees, as it were. Now when a Foundation weakens, a whole structure suffers . . ."

"Hmmm," hummed the Prince Profit.

"You're thinking, of course, sire, that the Foundation has held up in years past and there's no reason it shouldn't today. That's where you err. No matter how strong the back, its efforts are determined by the will. And when the will becomes negatively stubborn, probably due to unhappiness caused by lack of attention and consideration for the Castle Employees on your part, the back relaxes, the Foundation sags and the Tower leans. And there's something else, too. All your suspicions of the subjects in Consumerville might be well founded. They're extremely influenced by the attitudes of the basic Foundation stones — the Castle Employees — favorably or otherwise."

"What's your suggestion?" asked the very tired Prince.

"Why, merely pay more attention to

the Foundation! Play another spotlight in that direction and when a fissure appears in the cemented relationships between the Foundation and the Great Castle BAI, mend it with the new "Fidelity Cement!"

"Fidelity Cement . . . ?"

"Yes, sir, mixed from Sincerity and Human Relationships!"

This time the Prince humped. But what else could he do, other than try the Jester's suggestion. So a few days later he directed a new spotlight on the Foundation. And whenever he discovered weaknesses he mixed together a few Human Relations principles. He was very Sincere. And, sure enough, the resultant "Fidelity Cement" produced gratifying results in no time at all.

Now the Sales Tower of the Great Castle BAI no longer leans as it did, and the Prince is constantly seen in the Stork Club with Lady Humor, who, if Winchell has it correct, is very appropriate in such a name-spot.

Oh, yes, and the Jester, Sprig-o-lettuce? He has been granted a new position in the court: Minister of Public Relations. And instead of his former grubby garb he daily now dons natty attire and carries with him a Golden Rule."

* * *

The Captain of Industry yawned open his mouth and his eyes, and reached for the book of adventure tales which had slipped to the floor. He nodded approvingly at sleeping Junior and tiptoed from the room.

But he didn't forget the story of the Great Castle BAI and he even told it to some of his Lieutenants the very next day.

And the result is that certain maneuvers have been revamped which make the War Against The Consumers appear to be more of a Great Books session, with a friendly if spirited give-and-take.

TELLING THE PRESS

By DORCAS CAMPBELL

Assistant Vice President
East River Savings Bank, New York, N. Y.

A PUBLIC RELATIONS executive — or a publicity specialist — knows how to dream up a story, how to create one, how to maneuver a good story into the right periodical. They need not apologize often for the “canned” material they release — usually it has good workmanlike qualities. Yet editors blast us orally at meetings — to which we invite them, or by a few well chosen words slapped out on a typewriter — and printed by invitation in our trade journals. I’m a little tired of it all.

Why are we so maligned? Is it time to point out to editors that people who live in glass houses shouldn’t throw stones. Editors have held the whiphandle too long. How about reversing the situation?

Editors hound us — asking for “typed copy, double spacing, our telephone number” and other trivia (a real editor will take a good story from penciled notes on an old envelope)! The energy, the aggressiveness and venom used by editors to point out elementary facts of publicity leaves me cold. Do they use similar tactics to teach their own reporters on the more important points of accuracy and the value of verification of

facts in a story? Could they do so? It is a horrible confession to make, but the inaccuracies, the short-comings of reporting today by staff men, make me raise a question on the value of granting an interview, unless a crisis requires it.

I prefer a “canned” release, checked and re-checked for accuracy, and telling a whole story, one which calls a spade a spade, and not limited to the glamour part of a story. And, I’m willing to tell a few editors so.

Actually my particular gripe is two-fold. First, because editors talk down to us (while secretly needing the help of all of us since their staffs are too limited to cover all the news wanted). Second, because New York City is a mecca for periodicals, publishing houses and other published media. For some reason, I am a sucker for these. Not just now and then, but year after year.

The phone rings. A voice blithely says, “I represent the X.Y.Z. Press and want a story on abandoned accounts, or how the housewife could save, or is rent too high, or is banking a career? It will take only twenty minutes.” I groan. The day is already ablaze with deadlines, trustees to be pampered, co-workers to be soothed. I’d hoped for an hour to cogitate leisurely over a little thing or two like the presentation of the annual budget and a draft of an anniversary brochure.

In the life of a p.r. executive “neither rain nor sleet nor gloom of night stays these couriers” of the press who seem to have all the rights on their side. Like any good p.r. director, I say O.K. to the reporter. He arrives. He is not a cub, nor

“TELLING THE PRESS” was written by Dorcas Campbell for the “Bulletin” of the Financial Public Relations Association and appeared in that publication recently. It is reproduced here, with Miss Campbell’s permission, because in her interesting article she has said many things that many of us have wished to say upon numerous occasions.

Miss Campbell is not new to “Journal” readers. Articles under her name have appeared here on several occasions.

yet a specialist in finance. Gently, quietly, explicitly, I tell the fundamentals—a savings and loan isn't a savings bank, how much savings banks can accept from the public, why commercial banks have service charges, and inevitably explain that a trust company didn't deliberately cheat his nice old grandma. I am a walking encyclopedia on finance, as learned as a Library of Congress bookworm relaying entertaining minutiae which is supposed to be of "human interest" merit. I spell words, correct phrases, secure charts and diagrams. I telephone other bankers for allied data.

Disappointed

The story appears shortly thereafter. It is a honey, it is *so* bad. It has errors, omissions, inferences, misspellings, inaccurate names and endless incomprehensible assertions. Thanks be, my name as the source of the story is omitted. The story cost me only a trifle of time, say two hours, but I am lucky. Nameless, I cannot be sued for libel nor lose too many friends. Banking has been served (I hope) and I've tried to live up to the expectations of the press. I'm disappointed in results, even ashamed — of the press, but I can bear it.

The phone rings again. A reporter wants a scoop. What can I offer? It is a woman's magazine, circulation vast; very tush, tush in tone. I moan. National circulation, eh? O.K. we're local, there's little chance of winning an account, but after all, Old Lady Prestige may be of value. I grant an immediate appointment and shove aside my daily program. With great ingenuity I start to gather names, addresses, ideas and singular story slants. The reporter has read my book on women in banking and thinks I am good for another few pages. I am; I give generously, wondering why I didn't push myself as hard and write the story . . . for my own by-line.

The reporter departs, promising me a look at the copy. As always, it fails to appear, but the magazine does. The story is off in only two or three vital facts, it is slanted too much on the plush side. And, it is liberal with names of persons I'd referred her to and names of banks I'd cited as outstanding. The name of my bank is conspicuously lacking. My president is always glad for me to devote some of my time to informing the public on banking — let's hope he continues to believe in such "time wasted" when the story doesn't even rate us four words. I sigh, and remind myself it's good for the cause of banking . . . and is experience for me. Meanwhile, I can labor at night to catch up in my own work!

The phone rings. I'm still not cured. An editor wants a story — fast, long and involved. He says it will be given the lead in his magazine. I write it fast (after all, I'm not a cub. I've been sponging up facts about banking for more than a decade). I give it plenty of good padding (I can hardly be squelched on my favorite topic), and I make it as simple as "a, b, c," in spite of its confused background.

Hardly Recognizable

The story appears in the rear of the magazine, cut, bruised, and just able to hold up its head. Mutilated and deleted, the story is hardly recognizable by the author. Her name is misspelled and her bank omitted. It is a national story, her accounts are strictly local.

Again the phone rings. Supposedly I'm hard boiled now — after these years of mistreatment. An Associated Press gal (Jean Meegan) asks for help on a story. I decline briefly, pleasantly. She says, "Jim said to call." "Oh!" I reply, "then come down." I hunt up eight folders of stories, material, statistics — the

(Please Turn to Page 30)

* The HOUSE ORGAN . . .

Where Personnel and Public Relations Meet

By L. W. HORNING

Vice President, Personnel and Public Relations, New York Central System

IT IS MY CONVICTION that the industrial publication — the employee publication in particular — is the focal point at which personnel relations and public relations converge. A considerable portion of this paper will deal with the function of the house organ as a link between the internal and the external aspects of industry's human relations.

I will confess that, when I discuss this subject, I am taking the liberty of dwelling on a favorite topic, one that has long commanded my interest. The whole time it has been my privilege to have a hand in dealing with both of industry's publics, I have had my attention drawn more and more to the essential connection between these two fields of contact. And, more and more, I have become convinced that the connection is nowhere better realized than in the industrial house organ.

First of all, internal though it may be in concept and execution, the company publication cannot help having its repercussions outside the employee family. If it is good enough to be taken home by the men and women who work for the company, it is going to be seen, not only by their families, but also by their friends, relatives, and visitors. Through other means as well — possibly through deliberate outside distribution — it is going to find its way into the hands of strangers. Their opinion of the company — even of its products — will be

influenced by what they think of the company magazine or newspaper. That is one of several reasons why it is never a good idea to scold, berate, or talk down to employees in their house organ, or to use the house organ as a place for discussing disciplinary matters. Rather, both the company and its employees deserve to be presented in the best possible light in the pages of their company journal. When that happens, the house organ is doing a public relations job with the public outside the company as well as with that inside.

The internal publication can be an especially fruitful source of favorable attention from the general public when it is used as the vehicle for significant pronouncements by top company executives. Many of the subjects which management wishes to discuss with employees have a definite interest value for other groups as well. Where this is true, it is an excellent practice to see that the issue containing the message is forwarded to media that may be interested in it as news or as editorial background material.

On several occasions we have found this an effective means of evoking comment in the general press on issues that we wanted to bring before the public as well as before our employees. At the same time, our employees took greater pride and interest in their company magazine when they saw it referred to and quoted in the public press. Also, the realization that their publication had been selected by management as the means of getting across an important pronouncement,

* Excerpted from a talk by Mr. Horning before the Industrial Editors Association, Chicago, February 18.

gave employees a closer sense of communication with their company.

Of course, the primary significance of such a message must always be for the employees. It would be the height of folly to "plant," as it were, in the employee publication, statements which actually are meant for customers, or legislators, or stockholders. No editor can afford to forget for whom he is editing his "book." This is a rule, by the way, which should be applied scrupulously in the selection of all material to go into the house organ.

Interpretation of Policy

While on the subject of using the company publication as a means of conveying management messages to employees, I would like to say a few things about the interpretation of company policy through the pages of the house magazine or newspaper. This is not a field in which simple, clear-cut principles are easy or safe to arrive at. For my part, I am not sure that we yet know exactly the fields within which the house organ should voice company opinion and the fields which it should steer around or shun altogether.

Fundamentally, we are all governed, I think, by a desire not to alienate the employee-reader from the publication designed for him, by making him feel that it is out of sympathy with his viewpoints. Guided by this consideration, many of us have avoided all areas of discussion which could in any way be deemed controversial. Are we right or wrong in so doing? Because this question is so complex, and because I am not prepared to advance any comprehensive clarification of it, I will not at this time do more than advert to its existence. I would, however, like to cite a recent instance from the experience of our company, wherein an issue, some phases of which were at least potentially

controversial, was turned to positive use in the pages of our magazine.

An occasion arose where it was necessary, because of a decline in travel volume, to make a number of service curtailments, not very significant proportionately but nevertheless rather important to the individuals whose jobs were affected. Because of railroad seniority rules, a change in one job can make itself felt in a widening circle, as one man, displaced from his former job, in turn displaces a junior employee and so on down the line.

The question arose: how to handle the matter in our employee publication? The need simply to inform employees of the service changes did not exist, since they knew of them before it would have been possible to tell them through the magazine. There was some thought that perhaps we should simply "let sleeping dogs lie" and ignore the matter entirely, especially since it appeared to be negative in nature.

Basically, however, that didn't strike us as being good coverage, whether in a house organ or in any other publication that appropriates to itself the function of providing information. So we looked for a useful way in which to present the story. And when we looked, we discovered that here was a tailor-made presentation for a message which we were constantly trying to find ways of getting across, but which invariably sounded too sermonish when it appeared in editorials.

Reported the Facts

Here is what we did. We reported the facts of the story, and in connection with them we quoted an official of the company. His statement said the decline in business which necessitated the service curtailments (and the job curtailments) served to point up the highly competitive nature of our business, and

the need for every employe to do his best to make our service so appealing to the public that business would not decline. In other words, a potentially "sour" story was turned, we believe, into a realistic, down-to-earth business lesson which every employe could, without any trouble, apply directly to himself and his job. It struck us as an opportune, aggressive piece of internal public relations, calculated to have an effect materially helpful to our external public relations.

Let us consider now another way in which the company publication, edited for employes and designed primarily to perform a mission with regard to employes, can nonetheless be a real auxiliary to the over-all external public relations program of a business concern. You are all familiar with, and many of you doubtless are taking advantage of, the frequent opportunity to use for publicity purposes, material which has been developed primarily for the company publication. As some editor has so well expressed it, when you do this you get "two for the price of one."

Neglected

Commonplace as this by-product utilization may seem, there are companies where it is neglected. Particularly in large organizations, where functions are highly departmentalized, opportunities for this kind of teamwork are likely to be passed up. Where a separate publicity department is maintained, the house organ editor can render a service by taking the initiative and passing along to the publicity people anything he turns up which seems to have publicity possibilities.

As a footnote to this point, I am reminded of a little device used by the editor of our company publication and the manager of our press bureau. Just for the fun of it, they keep a monthly

box score, recording the number of items each "borrows" from the other — house organ stories that are worked up into press releases, and press releases that are adapted for use in the house organ. In this way both departments are always on the lookout for ways in which the work they have done can be of use to the other fellow. The number of "plus values" thus chalked up over a period of time is considerable.

Future of House Organ

It would not be amiss at this point to say something about the future of the internal industrial publication. What will be its place in the business organization of years to come? Emphasized to an unprecedented degree during the past several years of business prosperity, how will it fare if we should encounter an economic setback some time in the future.

Trite as it may sound, the answer to these questions is that the future of the house organ depends upon the people who produce it. How long it will last and to what stature it will attain are contingent upon the extent to which the editor can make his publication contribute to the success of his firm and therefore to the economy on which it depends for support.

The house organ which really builds constructive personnel relations within a firm justifies itself in terms of greater efficiency, higher production, better-satisfied employes, more stable communities, and a sounder economy. This may seem a wide circle of benefit to result from the comparatively small "splash" that any one publication can hope to make, but, with a cumulation of many efforts, it is all within the realm of possibility.

In this connection, it is rather disturbing to note that confidence in the house organ as an effective instrument is not

always so strong as it might be among the very people who should have most faith in it — namely, house organ editors themselves. In fact, virtually the only pessimism one encounters regarding the potentiality of the internal publication is found right in that editorial fraternity. This, of course, may be due to an exaggerated modesty; but the likelihood seems greater that it stems from a basic underestimation of what a house organ can, and is supposed to, do.

Complaint

Some house organ editors complain that they do not receive the satisfaction which editors of general magazines and papers derive from watching circulation figures grow, knowing that people like their product well enough to pay good money for it. "We just put the thing out month after month," these editors say, "and whether it's good or bad doesn't seem to make much difference to anyone but us."

Granted, there is a disadvantage in this lack of a tangible criterion by which an industrial publication's success may be measured. Yet, rather than a disadvantage, isn't this merely another challenge to the editor — a challenge to devise some means of discovering just how successful his product is, of finding out how well his "book" is going over?

Surveys and questionnaires offer an approach to this problem, and so does candid talking with employees and supervisors, *if* they know the editor really wants candid talk. It requires a thick skin to absorb the cross-fire of criticisms which any publication, however well done, will receive when its readers loosen up and start telling how they would do things. But a durable hide is part of an editor's stock in trade anyway, and he will do well to expose it frequently to some pot-shots from his public.

To the house organ practitioner, then, who is in doubt about the future of his medium, I would say: Don't doubt the place of your publication. Establish its place. Appropriate for it a utility which will render it an indispensable tool in the personnel policy of your company. The jobs you can make it do are jobs that your management is searching zealously for means of performing. As industrial editors, you serve as a medium of communication between industrial management and the people who are industry. In some matters, you are the most effective, if not indeed the only means of such communication. In the specialized field of employee relations, you provide, as it were, the "Two Way Street" which Dr. Eric Goldman has so illuminatingly explored for us in his little book by that name. You are at once management's voice before employees and the voice of employees among themselves and before the world.

You have on your side the basic channels of communication between men, and you can turn the use of them to advantage in the solution of problems that are among the most vital to man's progress and happiness. That is why your work is, or should be, one of the most satisfying of all jobs in the business world today.

Word of Caution

And now, in conclusion, a word of caution. Let us not forget that, in the employee publication, we are working in a specialized medium and for the most part we have to develop our own principles and standards. Great as may be the temptation or inclination, we must not in this job slavishly bind ourselves to the rules that govern some other kind of journalistic endeavor, time-worn and tested though those precepts may be in their own field. If we devote all our energies to making our house organs

look and feel like some secular journal that appeals to us or appeals to the public in general — and in so doing forget the specialized mission we are supposed to perform—then we are pursuing false gods and we will end by failing in our assigned duty.

This is a call to industrial editors to affirm the distinct and separate nature of the field in which they work. Only by

doing so can they properly begin to explore that field. And, from a background of long and extensive work in many aspects of labor-management relations, let me say that never has the need been greater for exploration and progress in the realm of labor-management communications. The potential which this situation presents to the industrial editor is unlimited.

Telling the Press

(Continued from Page 25)

works. She reads, she imbibes, she questions, she queries, she goes off to her office, promising to let me see the story before publication. I'm cynical now, I know it won't be sent to me.

She writes (and rewrites, I'll wager) and, bless me, actually sends copy to me. At last, I think, I'll have a chance to help a reporter do a good job. She fools me; I can't help her. The story leaves me ready to swoon — with envy. Except for two words I didn't know, didn't like and couldn't find in the dictionary, it was the best of stories. An old hackneyed yarn it was refreshed and refurbished beyond my comprehension. I telephone, with unusual enthusiasm and give her the "go ahead" signal. (The two words of race track vintage she voluntarily decided to delete). My faith in the reporter world is renewed.

At last a good story by a reporter I can't believe it. Maybe a good reporter does read, think, check, rewrite . . . and is willing to submit copy. Are there other good reporters? Does any editor care?

When a reporter produces a good story out of an interview I notify his editor by letter that a good job was done and by whom. When a bad job is

done I say nothing. Obviously I don't have to write very many letters. I wonder if editors have ever noticed this?

Amateur reporters of the press are more usual than amateur p.r. executives — or publicity specialists. Can we — as p.r. folk — help a few editors see the need for imagination, accuracy in reporting, timeliness, and fairness to story sources. When facts and figures have been corralled and weeded out by specialists, let's try to get editors to teach their reporters how to use them with loving care. When I assemble basic facts, including statistics for New York City, savings banking, banking in general, often for the whole United States and sometimes for foreign lands, I feel responsible for their use — does the reporter?

When I supply leads, ideas, stories I want to see reliable material evolve from it. Can an editor see the problem and teach his men and women to make the most of it? If they don't, I'll feel justified hereafter, in being out when help is wanted. When I see carefully gleaned facts tossed about so easily, I grow bitter and what's more I become more and more devoted to the "canned" release.

LOOK FOR THE BURS UNDER THE PR SADDLE

By ERLE PHELPS HANNUM

THE "NEGATIVE APPROACH" has no standing with experts in the field of business management. It is especially obnoxious to leaders in sales engineering. As a matter of fact, it has no standing with anybody but me, and I just took it up today when I decided to start this article on public relations.

There is really nothing unnatural about going at a subject like this backward, because people *think* negatively. Anyone will agree, I am sure, that it is characteristic of the human mind to look for something wrong about an organization, a product, a service, or an individual. If I knew a good student of literature, I believe I could get him to find a pat quotation for this spot; one to the effect that it is easier to throw rocks than roses because it is not as hard on the arm.

Briefly, this is what I mean by the negative approach to public relations. Take away all the things people don't like about you and they'll begin to think you're all right. Admittedly, this is reducing the problem almost to absurdity, but since these public relations discourses sometimes get complicated, it is well to start simply.

The way to begin is obvious. Get together the biggest list you can of the characteristics of your operations which are known to have irritated your customers or the general public at one time or another. How to do it? There are *two* ways. The public attitude survey is one. The second way is to produce the list yourself. If you don't know all the irritants, someone — or all the combined someones in your organization —

can produce a good one if they try.

Suppose then, that having the list, you examine it. Suppose further, that taking all the sources of irritation, item by item, you could fix every one. Smooth sailing, Sir, would be your lot. But don't start heaving this article toward File A. I am not naive enough to think that you can fix everything. You have obstacles. But suppose you agree you can fix some and modify others. You have just joined the Negative Approach Branch of the I, Too, Am on the Road to Success in Public Relations Society of America.

Back to the list again. Here is a mythical one, kept short on purpose, and put up chiefly to show how the customer "beefs" fall into categories. In parenthesis are a few of my own comments as a customer. You could add hundreds of your own.

The Product or the Service

Not consistently top notch.

Too hard to get.

(I'm thinking of a brand of canned food I won't buy because I once opened a bad can. Maybe, Mr. Processor, that has to happen once in a while, but you lost me.)

The Package

Too hard to get into.

Have to stand on your head to read the directions.

Rules, Regulations and Practices

No sense to the rule.

Your rules were made for dead-beats, and are insulting to honest people.

Your return envelopes are too small for your bill stubs.

(Not long ago, far from home, I lost the round trip portion of a transportation ticket. It was a tough seige. I got the bad news that I would have to pay full fare back home, and file a claim for a refund. The best I could expect, I was told by the company's representative, was that I would get my money back in four months. There was something about "legal requirement," but it didn't go down well. I'll probably always think that this rule is unnecessarily severe. P.S. — I found my ticket.)

Delays

Deliveries late.

Statements late.

Replies to inquiries slow.

(Every business could profit by adopting the practice of acknowledging every inquiry, or every communication, for that matter, within 24 hours. If full answer is impossible, what's the matter with a "we're working on it" letter? Isn't this just good business manners?)

Discourtesy

Bad office manners.

Bad store manners.

Bad telephone manners.

(I may get an argument, but I think this kind of irritant is the easiest one to fix. It can't be an accident that you get treated right in one place and not in another.)

General Inefficiency

People complain that you get orders balled up.

Your billing is inaccurate.

You misspell names.

You didn't follow instructions.

Citizenship

You're not fitting in with the community.

You are not playing ball with the legitimate drives and fund-raising campaigns.

The only time you visit fellow businessmen is when you want something.

Appearance

Your plant is unattractive.

So are your vehicles.

Prices and Rates

Too high.

Not logical.

(Recently I bought a \$5.00 item of brand merchandise for \$1.00 at a clearance sale in a reputable, high class store. I'm suspicious of that first advertised price, and may remain suspicious. Do you blame me?)

Information

You don't tell me anything about your business.

Your advertising is ahead of your product or service.

So much for the list. If you try out this plan, remember one thing. Shift gears fast. Abandon the negative and go into positive, because it will take positive action to effect any cures, and positive words to tell about how you did it.

MR. ERLE PHELPS HANNUM is General Information Manager of The Pacific Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company for the Washington-Idaho area. Prior to his twenty years service with this company he was city editor of the Spokane Daily Chronicle.

Book Review Section

CHACE CONLEY, Book Review Editor

SUPERVISION IN BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY

Reviewed by Benn Hall, Public Relations Consultant, New York City.

THE RECENT miraculous war-time production record of American factories taught top management that the human equation is a vital factor — morale was often the intangible item that made for increased outputs.

In *Supervision in Business and Industry* the importance of dealing with people as human beings and not numbers is stressed. The authors, Robert D. Loken, Director of Employee Training, Neiman-Marcus Co., Dallas and Earl P. Strong, Professor of Management and Director of Business Management Service, University of Illinois, have produced a book of particular interest to public relations and publicity executives, especially those associated with industrial concerns or firms employing large staffs.

Showing the contrast between the old-time "boss" and the more modern, and understanding type, the authors stress that leaders must possess not only job skill but also understand job management and "man management."

One of the chief advantages of this book for the public relations man is that it graphically illustrates the problems that can easily arise in a plant — problems that may not always be apparent to a public relations man who hasn't worked in a factory. The many human causes of poor production are made clear. Such background information is invaluable in editing internal house organs, preparing posters and other employee material.

Public relations officials will also find this a good book to place in the hands of others, including personnel and supervisory employees, to give them a broader perspective of human relations, and of their own role in creating even better relations.

Graphic charts and useful check lists are other important assets in this valuable book, which is based on material secured from more than 50,000 foremen and supervisors from various types of business and industry. (*SUPERVISION IN BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY*, by Robert D. Loken and Earl P. Strong. Funk & Wagnalls Co. 225 pp. — \$3.50.)

FILM AND EDUCATION

Reviewed by George S. Gladden, J. Walter Thompson Co., New York City.

FILM AND EDUCATION is a thirty-seven chapter symposium. The chapters range from discussions of the nature of educational films ("the motion picture in any or all of its uses when it is intended to inform, orient, or motivate its audience to some useful end") to such specifics as "Application of the Educational Film in Mathematics," "Application of the Film in Music Education," "The Film in Medical and Nursing Education," "The Education Film in Great Britain," and a chapter on the "Public Support of Audio-Visual Programs."

In this writer's opinion *Film and Education* is an excellent work. With the ever growing importance of motion pictures as an educational "tool," such a book, with its comprehensive and practical discussions of the present status of the educational film in all phases of modern life should prove of great value to

anyone who, in any way, has occasion to work with film as a medium for teaching. To the best of my knowledge it is the first well organized, handy reference volume on the subject published.

The symposium is edited and prefaced by Godfrey M. Elliott, editor-in-chief of Young America Films, a post-war pioneer in the production and distribution of education films. The book is written by thirty-seven members of the "Who's Who" of educational films — each a recognized specialist in his or her field. Typical of the names in the roster of authors are Dr. Brandt, Professor of Psychology at Drake University; Mr. K. Norberg, Research Associate of Encyclopedia Britannica Films (a concern that is in frank competition with Young America Films); Miss Irene Sauble, Director of Exact Sciences of the Detroit Public Schools; Mr. J. Buckler, Coordinator of Visual Education of the International Business Machines Corporation; Mr. K. Haas, Director of Retail Training of Montgomery Ward and Company; and Mr. C. Lindstrom, Chief of Motion Picture Service of the U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Like all symposiums, *Film and Education* is not to be read at one sitting. It is more to be considered as a reference book or text book, wherein each individual chapter offers a wealth of detailed information and thinking on one particular phase of the over-all subject.

My criticisms of the book are minor and perhaps not valid. First, since the majority of the authors are engaged in the teaching profession, it is not surprising that there is a certain tedious pedagogical wordiness in many of the chapters — long paragraphs which an advertising copywriter would boil down to a single sentence. Secondly, and typical of any symposium on any subject, there is a definite amount of redundancy and overlapping of thoughts and writing be-

tween many of the chapters. Thirdly, there are, in my opinion, sins of omission, notably on the subject of collateral material to be used with educational films, on the subject of industry-sponsored motion pictures, and on the subject of propaganda films produced by governments, labor unions, etc. These, again, are minor criticisms and detract little from the over-all excellence of the work. (*FILM AND EDUCATION*, edited by Godfrey M. Elliott. Philosophical Library. 597 pp. — \$7.50.)

HANDBOOK OF RADIO PRODUCTION

Reviewed by Hendry Lars Bart, Editor, Author, New York City.

THE RECIPE for making a radio producer should begin, "First, catch your sponsor . . ." and with a sponsor, a producer should find his conscience as good a guide as a book. But even though this book, which doesn't mention sponsors in its otherwise comprehensive directory, will not make you a radio producer it will give a public relations executive a valuable fund of concise, competent information.

Mr. Barnouw explains microphone characteristics, control board mechanics, and the production of sound effects. Even more important, he takes apart the jobs of those on the radio budget and shows you what they are supposed to do.

There is enough practical description in this book to guide you about a radio studio. It will teach you that the man who appears to be cutting his throat is not commenting on the program. It will make you familiar enough with radio to advise a client who may have to speak over the air.

All speakers, on or off the air, may benefit by the sound advice Mr. Barnouw gives to announcers. In "Roundtable Etiquette" and "Quiz and Interview Etiquette" he proves himself the

Emily Post of discussion. The public relations advisers to quiz masters ought to send this book to their clients after underlining the paragraphs starting, "Don't talk down to a guest."

You can skip the chapters in which Mr. Barnouw feels it is necessary to kiss the medium that feeds him. To this successful producer radio serves only, "public interest, convenience, or necessity," and all those before the mike are "artists."

But you will find most of the book and the production directory in the back of real value. The directory is a guide, a glossary, and an index. It will tell you how to tell a cardioid mike from a calliope, when to board fade a blacksmith shop, and where to buy bagpipes. Most of all it will enable you to decipher the patois you hear in radio circles and let you eavesdrop at Toots Shorr's (*HANDBOOK OF RADIO PRODUCTION*, by Erik Barnouw. Little, Brown and Company. 324 pp. — \$4.50.)

ACTIONS AND PASSIONS

Reviewed by Philip Klarnet, Public Relations Counsel, New York City.

TO SOME public relations men, and to many of their clients, "Max Lerner" are fighting words. Nonetheless, his latest book is recommended particularly to those constitutionally disposed to recoil from anything one millimetre to the left of the late President McKinley. Lerner's essays show there is intelligence, honesty and logic on the side of those troubled by the actions and motives of men in our acquisitive society. The Freedom Train's archives teach us that America has been getting better and better; Lerner thinks we can improve.

Actions and Passions is made up of pieces culled from Lerner's columns in *PM* and its recently interred successor, the *New York Star*, during 1944-48. Lerner's editorial style has the weakness

of most of *PM*'s signed editorials: verbosity and an overactive first person singular. But his opinions have the strength of what was best in *PM*: a crusading spirit, a passionate concern with men's freedoms, and a refusal to tailor ideas to the pattern of party line clichés.

Unlike Friedrich Hayek, whose *Road to Serfdom* a few years ago enjoyed a short-term vogue as the bible of the everybody-should-spend-money-but-the-government school of thought, Lerner feels no compulsion to wash his mouth out with soap after he says a dirty word like "planning." He approves of planning — by government as well as by business; and he believes more TVAs will lead to a happier and healthier country, not to serfdom and sickness.

Nor does he get a nervous stomach at the sound of the word "union." He thinks strikes are legitimate weapons to which most unions resort only in desperation, not gimmicks by which they seek "domination" over industry. No doubt there are points on both sides of this argument, but there is no escaping the fact that the "domination" charge is hurled around just as loosely by industry as the "unfair" accusation is by labor.

The public relations dream world, as outlined by leading theorists of this profession, is one Max Lerner would endorse. In that world, policy will be determined by a scale of human values instead of economic drives. But Lerner thinks we're miles from that ideal — a point of view with which few public relations practitioners will agree.

With the issues so sharply drawn on both sides, each would do well to take a look at the other's view. Most of us know how the other half live, but it would also be worthwhile finding out how they think. (*ACTIONS AND PASSIONS*, by Max Lerner. Simon & Schuster. 367 pp. — \$3.50.)

THE WEATHERVANE

By
GEORGE DICKSON SKINNER

DUES AND REWARDS

SEVERAL TIMES RECENTLY, both in meetings and in private conversation, I have heard the question raised, "What do the members get out of the Public Relations Society of America?"

Most often, the question has come up in discussions of dues. "What am I getting for the dues I pay the national Society? Especially if I've got to pay Chapter dues in addition, I want to know what I'm getting for the money I pay the Society."

No accounting in dollars and cents can answer those who speak thus. They know that the budget was made by men competent to calculate the cost of the national operation. What they are really questioning is the value of that operation. What good is the PRSA to a member?

The question calls for answer. In the enthusiasm and the detail of launching a really national organization, there has been a tendency to assume that the value of the undertaking was self-evident. We forget that the preceding organizations made themselves felt chiefly through chapter activities. Those activities continue. If they are more vital and more telling than before, that is still a gain which could have been made by efforts within the chapters. There are, of course, a few public relations people who have little opportunity to take part in chapter affairs, but the PRSA was not organized just for them. What can it do for the rest that the chapters could not do?

I believe that the Society can make it possible for the whole public relations field of activity to accomplish more for the national economy and general welfare and that, by doing so, it will make it possible for each member to do his own work better and more profitably.

The function of the Society is, in a sense, the reverse of the functions of the chapters. The latter aim to raise the status and achievements of public relations by what they do for their members. The Society, on the contrary, benefits the members by what it does for public relations.

A House to Live In

In the first place, it gathers scattered and superficially diverse activities under one roof of common objectives and methods. It builds a professional house for public relations people to live in.

The work that we recognize as public relations began because it was needed. Like every profession, it has a clear mission to fulfill for the economic and social welfare. Our job of interpretation and communication is essential to the sound functioning of a complex, industrialized economy. That broad generality covers details as different as employee relations and product publicity, stockholder relations and drives to promote political action. But under all these and our other services is a basic unity of concept and similarity of approach which is the essence of public relations. To demonstrate and clarify that basic

substance gives to all public relations work an authority it could not have if each practitioner and each operation stood alone, not identified with the rest of the work that has the same broad function.

By drawing qualified practitioners from this whole area of activity into a single group, the Society defines and establishes the professional field.

It makes the practitioners themselves conscious of common ends and common means. In this community of interest, it helps them to clarify their own specific objectives and to develop and adapt their own techniques. It creates lines of communication through meetings and publications that carry the thinking and the experience of public relations people in every part of the country to those in every other part. It welds scattered individuals with more or less similar jobs into a profession aware of its mission.

The Society establishes the professional field also for the public. The very fact that the public relations practitioners of the country have organized themselves into a national body claims recognition for the place of this work in the national scheme of things. But it is up to the Society to do still more. It has to do that much-discussed job of public relations for Public Relations — to spread public understanding of what Public Relations means and respect for what it can do.

Police Department

The second great task for the Society is to keep the profession deserving of esteem. Having built the house, we've got to keep it in good running order. There is no governmental authority to license public relations practitioners or to set up standards either of competence or of conduct. We've got to be our own police department.

This can be effectively done only at

the national level. If public relations is to maintain the respect of the people, it has got to mean the same thing in Texas that it means in New York, the same thing in St. Louis that it means in Chicago or San Francisco. That meaning must include certain skills and certain ethical standards.

The Society has already established rough minimum standards of competence by its requirements for admission. Canons of ethics have still to be formulated. When that has been done, the Society will have the continuing task of enforcing them.

By these standards and the way they are maintained, the public relations profession will rise or fall in esteem. Only a national organization can establish and maintain them.

A Frame for Your Picture

The national organization establishes a frame of reference for each member. It places him. It gives him more than professional acceptance by other practitioners. It identifies him with defined ideals and standards.

If the member gets nothing from the PRSA but the mere fact of membership, it is well worth all the sweat and headaches it has cost — and the comparatively few dollars it must always cost.

Each member can do a better and a bigger job as the Society raises the status of this whole field of activity. As the Society claims and gains recognition and respect for the profession, the member gains recognition for his right to speak, decide and act on matters in the public relations field. He gains in responsibility and, in the long run, in the rewards of responsibility.

The run may not be so long as it sometimes seems. The day-by-day advance is compounded of thousands of individual impressions and actions. Perhaps their cumulative effect will not be

clearly perceived till we can take a backward look over a period of years. But the Society marks the direction of movement, and the direction is right.

The perspective is unmistakable. Public relations work is needed for the free functioning and harmonious development of our modern world — particularly for the American way of life in the modern world. The national organi-

zation is needed for the growth of the profession in respect and authority. And certainly the advance of the profession means broader opportunities with commensurate rewards for the public relations man.

The question for the member to ponder is not what he gets from the Society but what he can give to its work. That, too, is a completely selfish question.

"While we may talk about customs and traditions of a society we must not forget that societies are composed of human beings and that all behavior, traditional or not, is individual behavior."

—Woodward and Sutherland, INTRODUCTORY SOCIOLOGY

TO COMPLETE YOUR FILES

Back Issues of the Public Relations Journal

A number of members and *Journal* subscribers have written to the editor requesting back issues of the *Journal* in order that they might bind complete volumes for reference purposes. Others wishing to follow a similar plan may procure back issues, Volume 4, numbers 1 through 12, 1948, at 50c per copy. Orders will be filled while a limited supply lasts. Please send checks with orders to: THE PUBLIC RELATIONS JOURNAL, 525 Lexington Avenue, New York 17, N. Y.

Al
Americ
mously
their a

Bond
Cham
Cothr
Elser
Fried
Hill,
Hollo
S
Hood
F
Hoov
N
Jobso
Lazo
C
Moss
t
Orm
r
Stew
A
Yutz

LeS
Mul
Sche

Welcome to New Members

At a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Public Relations Society of America, Inc. held on February 2, 1949, the following individuals were unanimously elected to membership in the Society, following the required posting of their applications:

ELECTED TO ACTIVE MEMBERSHIP

- Bondurant, Jack**—Partner, Mathis, Murphey & Bondurant, Atlanta, Georgia.
Chamberlin, Jo Hubbard—Columbia University, New York City.
Cothran, Ben J.—Partner, Elser & Cothran, New York City.
Elser, Maximilian, Jr.—Partner, Elser & Cothran, New York City.
Friedman, Harold—Proprietor, Harold Friedman & Associates, Newark, N. J.
Hill, John W.—President, Hill & Knowlton, Inc., New York City.
Holloway, Barry J.—Vice President in Charge of Public Relations, Grolier Society, Inc., New York City.
Hood, Caroline (Mrs. John Hayward Carlin)—Director of Public Relations, Rockefeller Center, Inc., New York City.
Hoover, Donald D.—Vice President and Eastern Manager, Bozell & Jacobs, Inc., New York City.
Jobson, Marian—Partner, Hartwell, Jobson & Kibbee, New York City.
Lazo, Hector—Director of Public Relations, Sunshine Biscuits, Inc., New York City.
Moss, Edward K.—Public Relations Director, American Management Association, New York City.
Ormerod, Major Cyril Berkeley—Director of Public Relations, British Information Services, New York City.
Stewart, Ernest B., Jr.—Public Relations Manager, National Cotton Council of America, Memphis, Tennessee.
Yutzy, Thomas D.—Partner, Dudley, Anderson & Yutzy, New York City.

ELECTED TO ASSOCIATE MEMBERSHIP

- LeSourd, Howard M.**—Dean, Boston University, School of Public Relations, Boston, Mass.
Mullaley, James H.—Director of Public Relations, Easy Washing Machine Corporation, Syracuse, N. Y.
Scherff, William Anders—Advertising Manager, Plymouth Cordage Company, Plymouth, Mass.

POSTINGS

THE By-laws of the Society require that applications for membership be posted at least 30 days before they are submitted to the Board of Directors or to the Executive Committee for approval. Active members desiring to comment on the following applicants should write the Eligibility Committee, Public Relations Society of America, Inc., 525 Lexington Avenue, New York 17, New York.

ACTIVE MEMBERSHIP

BARBER, PHILIP W.—Partner, Robbins and Barber, New York City. *Sponsors:* I. D. Robbins and Kalman B. Druck.

MACK, JOHN P.—Vice President and Assistant Treasurer, American City Bureau, Chicago, Ill. *Sponsors:* Edgar J. Bittenheim and Denny Griswold.

NELSON, HALE—Vice President, Illinois Bell Telephone Company, Chicago, Ill. *Sponsors:* E. M. Claypool and Hazel R. Ferguson.

ASSOCIATE MEMBERSHIP

CRING, M. RITCHEY—Assistant to President, Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad Co., St. Louis, Mo. *Sponsors:* Thomas W. Parry and J. Handly Wright.

DAUER, ERNST A.—Director of Consumer Credit Studies, Household Finance Corporation, Chicago, Ill. *Sponsors:* W. T. Christian and Burr Blackburn.

FORRESTAL, DAN J., JR.—Assistant Director, Industrial and Public Relations Department, Monsanto Chemical Company, St. Louis, Mo. *Sponsors:* Thomas W. Parry and J. Handly Wright.

HARDY, C. COLBURN—Assistant Director of Public Relations, Merck & Co., Inc., Rahway, N. J. *Sponsors:* Verne Burnett and V. L. Rankin.

McKEE, JAMES E., JR.—Director, Community Relations, Monsanto Chemical Company, St. Louis, Mo. *Sponsors:* Thomas W. Parry and J. Handly Wright.

PUBLIC RELATIONS SOCIETY OF AMERICA

INCORPORATED

OFFICERS

HANDLY WRIGHT, *Chairman of the Board*
Monsanto Chemical Company
St. Louis

WILKINSON RANKIN, *Executive Vice President*
Public Relations Society of America, Inc.
New York City

WILLIAM R. HARSHE, *Vice President (Central)*
William R. Harshe Associates, Inc.
Chicago

ELSON ALDRICH, *Vice President (Western)*
Utah Copper Company
Salt Lake City

FREDERICK BOWES, JR., *Treasurer*
Pitney-Bowes, Inc.
Stamford, Conn.

AVERELL BROUGHTON, *President*
Averell Broughton
New York City

JOHN P. BRODERICK, *Vice President (Eastern)*
Doremus and Company
New York City

MAXWELL E. BENSON, *Vice President (Southern)*
General Shoe Corporation
Nashville

LEE TRENHOLM, *Vice President (Canada)*
Provincial Paper, Ltd.
Toronto

RICHARD B. HALL, *Secretary*
Richard B. Hall & Associates
Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

AMUEL D. FUSON, *Chairman*
HOWARD CHASE

MILTON FAIRMAN
ALLAN HERRICK

ALFRED McCLUNG LEE
ABBOTT WASHBURN

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

ELSON ALDRICH
Utah Copper Company
Salt Lake City

WILLIAM E. AUSTIN
Dominion Brewers Association
Ottawa

MAXWELL E. BENSON
General Shoe Corporation
Nashville

W. J. BERGHOFF
Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.
Pittsburgh

ARVIN M. BLACK
University of Mississippi
University, Mississippi

FREDERICK BOWES, JR.
Pitney-Bowes, Inc.
Stamford, Conn.

AVERELL BROUGHTON
Averell Broughton
New York City

HOWARD CHASE
General Foods Corporation
New York City

FRANKLIN R. CHURCHILL
Oregon Journal
Portland

WILEY B. COTTEN, JR.
Standard Oil Co. of N. J.
Baton Rouge

WIL DALTON
Courier-Journal
Louisville

EDWARD DRAPER
American Meat Institute
Chicago

MILTON FAIRMAN
The Borden Company
New York City

SAMUEL D. FUSON
The Kudner Agency
New York City

ROBERT R. GROS
Pacific Gas & Electric Co.
San Francisco

REX F. HARLOW
Public Relations Institute of
the West, San Francisco

ALLAN HERRICK
Security First National Bank
Los Angeles

W. D. HINES
Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.
Akron, Ohio

GORDON D. HULME
Shawinigan Water & Power Co.
Montreal

L. E. JUDD
Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.
Akron

WILLIAM D. KENNEDY
Ford Motor Company
Dearborn, Michigan

IRENE KUHN
National Broadcasting Co.
New York City

ALFRED McCLUNG LEE
Wayne University
Detroit

BURNS W. LEE
Rexall Drug Company
Los Angeles

ED LIPSCOMB
National Cotton Council
of America, Memphis

BOYD F. McKEOWN
Board of Education of the
Methodist Church, Memphis

HENRY E. NORTH
Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.
San Francisco

ROBERT S. PEARE
General Electric Company
Schenectady, N. Y.

JOHN E. PICKETT
California Farmer
San Francisco

CONGER REYNOLDS
Standard Oil Company
Chicago

F. L. RICE
Phillips Petroleum Company
Bartlesville, Oklahoma

PAUL O. RIDINGS
Texas Christian University
Fort Worth

LEE TRENHOLM
Provincial Paper, Ltd.
Toronto

CLEMENT E. TROUT
Oklahoma A & M College
Stillwater

FRANKLYN WALTMAN
Sun Oil Company
Philadelphia

ABBOTT WASHBURN
General Mills, Inc.
Minneapolis

PAUL G. WEAVER
Public Relations Counsel
Seattle

WILLIAM G. WERNER
Proctor & Gamble Company
Cincinnati

J. HANDLY WRIGHT
Monsanto Chemical Company
St. Louis

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

525 LEXINGTON AVENUE, NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

?

Just who is

●

the press

- When people speak of "the press", it is generally a reference to unnumbered newspapers, magazines, news services and, vaguely, to screen and radio. No one known to us has ever set down in detail just WHO constitutes the US press.

- From 41 directories, 20 thousand questionnaires, hundreds of personal calls — we have listed its elements. Included are the important newspapers and magazine editors together with their staff, foreign language publications, wire services, syndicates and book publishers. Likewise, the "opinion-making" freelance writers, radio and TV programs, newsreels, and house organ editors.

- There are 5,638 names. The list is not for sale. But, a copy of **FEATURE** goes every two months to the entire list. You can send your feature stories to the press thereby in a comprehensive, economical manner. Write for a free copy.

feature

Central Feature News, Inc., Times Building, Times Square, New York 18

bered
o. No
ress.
rsonal
s and
wire
free-
rs.
ATURE
ies to
copy.